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*The Crucible* Part 2

1. Jackie strongly disagrees with the notion of confessing to a crime that she didn’t commit in order to avoid punishments. Those who are wrong doers should face the music for their actions. Those who are innocent should not take the fall for those who have wronged themselves and others. In reality who would confess to a crime they didn’t commit. Anyone with any brain cells would not self-incriminate themselves. Most people lie and put the blame on others to protect themselves without truly analyzing their actions and how they could affect an individual. Jackie is a very frank individual. If she has done wrong she willingly admits to her mistake and handles the situation like a civilized being. It’s natural to keep one’s reputation clean. In social standards one is judged by appearance, career, and reputation. If one is tarnished the individual is viewed as worthless. Throughout history one’s reputation equals his/her status in society and treatment by others. Kings and Queens received praise, glory, and fame that come with the title and reputation. In places like China where work equaled self-worth, merchants were seen as the lowest social class since they made their fortune off the labors and expense of others. In Jackie’s opinion she will admit to her own faults, but when it comes to self-incriminating herself for no logical reason than to avoid a punishment she would rather receive the punishment than to lie to save her own behind. Jackie is a very stubborn, driven, and justified individual. She defends for the weak and fights for what she believes is right. Lying to save herself is a scam and an act she dares not to commit. She is not a hypocrite in her own book and continues to be that way. In her opinion those who try to hide and escape are weak and can never grow as individuals. In life you must face trials and tribulations, without them one cannot expect to grow and mature. Same concept with rewards and punishments. How can one learn what is right or wrong in their book without experiencing punishment and reward. Life is too short to seep secrets under one’s rug. Life is all about change, growth, and knowledge that is accumulated as one ages. As one crews up on the path of life those punishments are meant to be a reference and memory to share with the next generation. All in hope to help the individual make future decisions without making the same mistake and teach the next generation what would happen if they were to do the same. Knowledge is power and so is punishment; revenge and corporal punishment do not always fit the bill for understanding the err to one’s ways. Reflection and tribulation help an individual comprehend the difference between words and actions as well as how like a chain reaction everything comes back to the point it started from; the key word to lying for the sake of one’s self is Karma.
2. In Jackie’s eyes the difference between right and wrong is not always clear. There is always a gray tone between black and white. In a life or death situation harming one’s neighbor for supplies is seen as socially wrong, but in that instances anyone would commit the same act. We are all animals and the ID has a strong control on our leash. One cannot escape animalistic drives and desires. Society cannot expect humans to turn off this instinct like a light switch. When gun rampages occur people knock over one another, push, shove, and even trample people like a herd of wild animals. All of this just to save their lives; without ever really knowing when it will terminate, and if it does we won’t be able to do anything before we have the chance to do so. Situational ethics is what most people refer to. That individuals will or will not react a certain way unless the circumstances and situation desires them to do so. All of these examples tend to be hypothetical, but do we really know if we would act in the same way we said we would? In Hammurabi’s law code the concept an eye for an eye always lays judgment for each and every action. If a carpenter builds a house and kills the client’s son the carpenter’s son would be killed to balance out the action. Can one truly agree with this logic? An eye for an eye makes the whole world blind fits here as well. How can we really draw the line between what is right and what is wrong. Most of history tends to be told from the Victor’s perspective. Does anyone sit there and question each and every action that is taken and tries to morally rationalize it? Of course not, if that were to happen humanity would be seen as vile, evil, an unable to make any decisions without choosing the wrong one. Even in Puritan society to those present it may seem simple to define right and wrong, but in reality it is impossible. In the *Scarlet Letter* does anyone have the right to say that Hester is a whore, or that her actions were unjustified? Or that Dimmesdale was in the wrong for committing Adultery and lying? What about the townspeople; who refused to accept the truth when Dimmesdale works up the courage to admit his sin and the inevitability of escaping sin? Even religion tries to make sense of morality to listing what is right by God and what is not. Those that should decide moral situations are the individual themselves. What may seem right to Jackie may not seem right to you. When we try to play God when tend to crash and burn as a society. Judgment on decisions should be left on to the individual since it affects whether they choose to act on their impulses or not. Humanity is twisted when we try to cover our animal eyes and thoughts. Judgment and justice equals different things; choose wisely.
3. Jackie believes in the concept of dying for what she believes in rather that lying to save her life. Martyrdom, the practice and strong belief when Christianity began to take root in Rome. To die for a worthy cause to the individual to make an impact on that standing. When many people were getting persecuted for following the faith of Christianity in Rome since it made mention of a bigger kingdom than the one Rome tried to show off many followers died knowing that their effort would be rewarded in Heaven. Jackie has strong convictions and beliefs, but wouldn’t necessarily die for them. Most people today would not even take that bold, risky chance either. People will stand up for their beliefs, but they refuse to die for them. As society has changed and developed the ideas about martyrdom have as well. In the classical era martyrdom was seen as a final resort to make a statement about a certain topic. Today the idea of martyrdom has changed from something drastic to prove a point to a mass of people protesting for a cause. Today martyrdom has become to a lesser extent the act of protesting. Martyrdom and protesting have been around as long as societies were formed; the need to speak out against ideas that were seen in the eyes of people as corrupt and wrong some were extremist and others were rationalists. It also depends on the situation for someone to feel that dying is the only option as well as how strong their convictions are toward a particular topic. In the time era of the Puritans dying and knowing themselves than others would interpret them seems logical. The village would see those who would die and names would be honored and forever remembered in History. In today’s society many would rather gather a mass force to intimate rather than having one or a few die. Today gathering in numbers has a bigger and higher chance for success. We have the right to petition and to assemble so dying is extremely unrealistic and unnecessary. With the goals and opportunities life has for everyone no one would die for any cause. Instead of throwing away their lives for a cause they won’t be remembered for it is logical to gather in numbers. Even today as society has become highly interconnected through media and technology becoming a force to reckon with is easier. Anyone can post their thought and opinion on Facebook and people with the same outlook will like and back it up. Followers will grow and dates and times of rallies can be finalized and anyone who is a supporter can show and stand by their convictions. Yes, Jackie believes one should die with their beliefs rather than lying to save their life. Everyone one has beliefs that they say they will die for; the importance of each and every thought differs per person. What Jackie may die fighting for another may find her efforts as wasteful. Situational ethics plays a role on how far someone is willing to stand by their convictions and how strong their convictions ring home to the individual.